

REMARKS

This responds to the Final Office Action dated July 20, 2010.

Claims 8 and 21 are amended; claims 1-7, 15-20, and 29 were previously canceled, without prejudice to or disclaimer by the Applicant; as a result, claims 8-14 and 21-28 are now pending in this application.

Example support for the amendments may be found throughout the original filed specification. By way of example only, the learned Examiner's attention is directed to the original filed specification page 7 lines 1-7.

The Rejection of Claims Under § 103

Claims 8-14 and 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2008/0134286 by Amdur et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,072,875 to Tsudik and U.S. Patent Number 5,774,551 to Wu et al. Obviousness requires that each and every element be taught or suggested in the proposed combination of references.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assessment of Wu in view of the prior amendments in the previous action. Specifically, the prior amendments stated that "the service contract is derived from an identity configuration for the principal and the identity configuration represents aggregated access policies and attributes for the principal with respect to the resource and all known services that are available to the principal." *Emphasis Added*.

In response, the Examiner cited Wu column 17 lines 1-14 and stated that "aggregated" is meant to collect or gather as defined by its plain meaning. This passage of Wu states that it maintains account validation attributes for each user's account. That is, each account service is for a single user and that user's account. This is singular and Applicant respectfully fails to see how this is aggregating for all known services available to a principal. *Emphasis added*. This describes an application to manage a single user account. It is not an aggregation of services and policies for a single user that includes the user's account and other accounts or other services outside the accounts.

At any rate, Applicant has clarified some terms above to make clear the distinction between what is claimed and the Wu reference and other references of the combination. As such, Applicant does not believe that the rejections can be sustained and respectfully requests an indication of the same.

Specifically, even if one were to assume that the cited services in column 7 lines 1-14 of WU were “all the known services” as recited in the prior amended claims, Applicant has changed that to define each service as an application or system for the principal to us to gain access to the resource. Therefore, assuming the user account is the alleged “resource” and the user is the alleged “principal” from the Wu reference; clearly the services available to the user from the user account are not services giving access to the user account they are services related to other aspects of the user’s account. That is, these services do not give the user access to the user account and Wu does not even state as much.

The remaining references of record also fail to teach this aspect of the amended independent claims as well.

Therefore, the rejections should be withdrawn and the claims allowed. Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

Reservation of Rights

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have equally addressed every assertion made in the Office Action, however, this does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record is relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by MPEP § 821.04.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (513) 942-0224 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or deficiencies, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402--0938
(513) 942-0224

Date 09-20-2010

By / Joseph P. Mehrle /
Joseph P. Mehrle
Reg. No. 45,535